

In still further response to the Office Action dated May 4, 2006, Applicant responds as follows:

Applicant, through Counsel, lists Claims 1 and 79 as readable on the provisionally elected Species 5, and adds to the list as follows:

Claims 1, 2, 13, 14, 19, 20, 22-24, 28, 31, 38, 52- 58, 62, 63, 65- 68, 71- 73 & 79- 82. [Counsel thanks the Examiner for identifying Claims 1 and 79 as “generic.”]

REMARKS

Counsel sincerely thanks the Examiner for simplifying the restriction.

Even as simplified, the current situation remains complex. The seven species differentiate “ ... patentably distinct combinations ... ” of inlet and exit ports, shapes, and number and orientation of longitudinal sides, etc. Note the third and fourth lines of the Summary of the Invention on Page 5 of the application:

“ ... compact homogenizer by configuring a light tunnel ... such that its straight length is folded multiple times ... ”

The compact homogenizer, as thus folded, permits the construction of a light beam path -- of the optically required length -- to be placed within a shorter physical structure -- of the structurally desired length which may be shorter than the optically required length.

Homogenizers, which typically have stringent optical requirements, are difficult to construct, particularly if they are to operate with lasers and with minimum distortion. Such homogenizers have been typically straight-through, with an entry port and an exit port, and may have included an energy-recycling feature.

Summary Allowance of generic claims 1 and 79 is requested.

Upon allowance of these generic claims, allowance of their respective dependent claims is generally permitted by the new MPEP rules.

Kanti Jain, Inventor

By Carl C. Kling
Carl C. Kling, Attorney
(Reg. 19137)